2: Lee T-5 (1855-1858) 1957
NO6 Comanche NO6

viously crossed, and after a journey of several days, at length entered a large town of, perhaps, two hundred tents, situated in a narrow, but luxuriant valley, over which the thoughtful and sedate Rolling Thunder had the honor to preside. On our arrival, the customary dances were duly performed—the bloody covenant of the square stick was solemnly renewed—the purchase money, consisting of skins and animals, was delivered in due form of savage law—and Kianceta, the Weasel, having braided into my long hair an incredible number of beads, as a parting token of friendship and affection, the Spotted Leopard, followed by his attendants, disappeared from my sight, thank God, forever.

The price paid for me on this occasion, so far as I could judge, exceeded even the price paid on the former sale; my value, in connection with the watch, bearing somewhat the same proportion to that of other, less fortunate captives, as the value of such trotting celebrities as "Ethan Allen," "Flora Temple," and "The Spirit of the Times" does in that of ordinary nags.

A description of one Indian village is, substantially, a description of all others. The same fashion of tents, the same regularity of streets, the same square in the center, characterize them all. The village of Rolling Thunder was situated in a more contracted valley than that of Big Wolf's or the Spotted Leopard's; in other respects it was the same. He had not neglected to take advantage of the privilege apertaining to his patriarchal office; consequently, he, likewise, had gathered into his tents four conjugal companions, whose euphonical names I here mention in the order of their ages. They were *So-waw*, *An-a-wak-ke-o*, *Ho-wawk-ke-no*, and *Se-ma-naw*, the Wise. The latter took charge of the watch, preserving it with all the care and tenderness that had distinguished her illustrious predecessors, Moko and Kianceta, the Weasel.

The Comanches

and easy to wear. Although there were variations to suit the individual taste and needs, the general pattern remained fairly uniform. A Comanche woman in motion was a graceful sight, with the gorgeous fringes swaying with every movement and the brilliant patterns of beading glittering in the sunlight or firelight.

The woman wore her hair cropped and traced the part line with vermilion, although she seldom went to the trouble of combing or otherwise caring for her hair; it just hung loose. The care that did not go into her hair was devoted to facial make-up. Her eyes were accentuated with red or yellow lines above and below the lids and sometimes crossing at the corners. Her ears were painted red inside, and both cheeks were daubed with a solid red-orange circle or triangle. She also occasionally tattooed her face and breast, and wore bracelets and necklaces. As a parallel to the strong institutional friendship between two men, two Comanche women friends might dress alike.

Little girls, unlike small boys, always wore some form of clothing. A girl wore a breechclout until near the age of puberty, when she donned the buckskin dress. She wore her hair long and in plaits.

Fine clothes were so prized for dressing up that each Comanche had a wardrobe case made of rawhide, called *nat'sakɜna*. It was envelope-shaped, laced together at the edges, and had a tie-down, fold-over flap. Thus it was different from the parfleche, or ɔyɔ:t, as the Comanche called the meat bag. In his case he kept his best suit, his leggings, moccasins, blanket, and braid wrappers. It was up to his mother to care for his wardrobe.

If he had a war bonnet or feathers, they were kept separately in a tubular bag, called *tunawɔs*, that could be slung from his waist as he rode his horse, so that they could be ready for instant donning in case of attack. In this bag was also carried war paint, a brush, and a mirror after mirrors became available. If the occasion arose, a Comanche wanted to look his best.

Home to the Comanche was his tipi, or conical skin dwelling. It represented a wonderful combination of utility and portability, for it could be raised or lowered within minutes. It was constructed of tanned buffalo hides sewed together and stretched, flesh side out, over a conical framework of from twelve to thirty poles. The standard number in the opinion of modern Comanches was twenty-two poles.

The Comanches

593 While a boy was growing up, a very close comradeship was likely to develop between him and a brother. The relationship between brothers became one of mutual helpfulness. It was based on mutual affection and interdependence in play, work, and war. There was no formality between them. An older brother gave the younger much helpful advice, and when they went on the warpath together, the older brother was likely to keep a watchful eye on a younger brother until he had become an experienced warrior. Even afterwards they remained closely associated and rendered mutual assistance. This relationship was carried to the point where they lent each other their wives; especially would an elderly married brother accommodate his younger unmarried brothers. However, he could expect reciprocity when the younger brother married. "He would never feel the same about his younger brother, if he refused to make it even."[11] This ● 572 close relationship was sometimes instituted between two friends, perhaps being more common where there was no real brother. In such a case the friend took the status of a "brother" in the relationship system of his comrade's family, assuming all the privileges and restrictions which went with the new status. Then the two friends ("brothers") were likely to marry sisters and thus become brothers-in-law, or *haints*, which is the same word as "friend."

882 A boy's education by advice and admonition was considered to have ended with his first journey to war. He was supposed to know by this time that to gain the approbation and respect of his people he must be brave and courageous in war, wise in council, cool and fearless in the midst of danger, ardent in his friendship, charitable to the less fortunate of his community, hospitable to strangers, and enthusiastic in his patriotism and devotion to the welfare of his tribe. 582 He was likely at that time to turn part of his attention to love and courtship and marriage. It was not uncommon for the male to marry at an early age. On the other hand, he was somewhat restrained by the desire to improve his social prestige by developing a reputation as a warrior, raider, or hunter. Also, he needed horses or other plunder to secure a wife. He might, of course, persuade his father to furnish the necessary horses, but it was far more respectable for a young man to acquire his own, so Comanche boys married at later age than girls.

[11] Informant: Post Oak Jim.

9: Gladwin E-5 (1940) 1948 NO6 Comanche NO6

602 daughter; in the same way, a girl who has been reared to a large extent by her
601 grandmother, especially if she is an orphan, or illegitimate, will be called "daughter," and will reciprocate by calling her grandmother "mother." It is interesting to note that these relationships, however artificial they may be, are always consistent. A person will never use a special relationship term toward another unless this other reciprocates by using an appropriate term toward the first.

The closer terms of kinship which we have just seen substituted for more distant correct terms are also extended in their application to non-related or little-known people toward whom one wishes to show friendliness or respect. Thus a man will usually call a stranger "father," or "mother's father," depending on his age—this latter term is considered to denote the closest relationship, as far as warmth and dependence go, of the two grandfathers.

More formalized are such usages as the reciprocal joking which goes on between grandparents and grandchildren, which operates largely by means of their using various sets of kinship terms and then making jokes about their consequences; this will be considered in more detail in the next section. Also, if
[572] two persons standing in a certain relationship to each other each have close
[195] friends of the same sex as themselves, these two friends may playfully adopt parallel relationship terms toward each other. The terms in this case have a phonetic pattern slightly different from the normal usage.

Perhaps of the same nature is the custom whereby two young men may call each other *nīmiīʻi?*, "our girl friends," to signalize some affair which they had with two girls who were friends; this usage is said sometimes to continue throughout life, though no instances were recorded.

In these examples it is evident that the universal applicability of kinship terminology and the choices of relationships which are presented, together with extensions of its usage outside of genealogically traceable relatives, make this system a remarkably flexible tool in the hands of its users. With the selection of terms there is, apparently, a selection of behavior patterns also, always followed consistently by both parties involved.

The Comanche seem to follow the usual custom in regard to more distant relationships, wherein the behavior patterns found in the immediate family become gradually less distinct and demanding, and more permissive in nature, providing opportunities for fulfilling them to any degree which the person wishes. Yet some aspects of behavior appear to persist very strongly; this is well exemplified by the alternation of sister and joking relationships already mentioned.

It remains now to see what these behavior patterns are which are associated with the relationship terms, and to what extent there is a distinct pattern for each term.

9: Gladwin E-5 (1940) 1948 NO6 Comanche NO6

does exist, senility or infancy almost always makes one or both participants comparatively ineffective. 603

The same factors which affect one's attitude toward more distant parents are also operative in the case of grandparents, with the effect of comparative age more strongly operative.

"Friends." While there is considerable variation in how clearly it is recognized and expressed by different individuals, there is no doubt that the Comanche share with other Plains tribes the custom of an institutionalized friendship between men of the same age. This usually had its origin in warfare, when one man or boy would save another's life by a deed of conspicuous bravery; or perhaps they would just go out together several times, and this friendship would grow to the point where it was openly recognized. Such friends became constant companions, sharing everything with each other, including their women friends; thus it is still customary for friends to refer to their respective partners as "our wife" or "our sweetheart," and other people use the dual form of the possessive in referring to a man's friend's wife as "your wife." A man uses terms for his friend's family which would equate the friend with a brother and this relationship was not infrequently realized in the old days through adoption. However, this rather romantic picture is somewhat spoiled by a revelation which profoundly shocked one of our rather idealistic interpreters, to the effect that this supposedly lifelong bond not infrequently became somewhat weakened, and a new "friend" came to fill the place of the old.[13] 572 [597] 572 183

Although warfare has become a thing of the past for the Indians (except for the battlefields of Europe and the Pacific), a few of the more romantic or lonesome individuals have attempted to continue this custom, but it has generally lapsed. One of our informants, (I), who came to his maturity shortly after the Comanche were rounded up at Fort Sill, embraced it quite vigorously, including the *nĭmĭ?ɔra?* relationship, but discovered after a time that his "friend" believed only in one-way sharing, and was forced to give it up.

Outside of this formalized situation, the use of the term *hɔic*, "friend," is not at all clear. Two major focal relationships are covered by it: the institutionalized friend, and one's brothers (though usually not one's own brothers). Both of these are spread out, often with very attentuated behavorial associations, to include a great number of people—in fact, virtually all males of one's own age or generation. These two groups of people merge and are, in fact, never really separate, for even in the friendship discussed above, they are combined insofar as possible. Yet in many cases a person is recognized as one or the other; individuals differ in this regard. T, for instance, referred to a man as 572 196

[13] A derived, but very distinct, practice was for a man of low prestige to enter into a *hɔic* relationship with a successful warrior. The subordinate partner acted essentially as a body-servant for his dominant "friend," especially on war-parties or while hunting, and in turn basked in the reflected glory and protection of a strong man. Linton, personal communication.

9: Gladwin E-5 (1940) 1948 NO6 Comanche NO6

572 196 *hâic* only if he wished to emphasize that for one reason or another he did not consider him a relative at all, and TY used *ɨ'·i?* in much the same way. All informants agreed that sibling terms provided a much closer and warmer way of expressing the relationship, but used the friend designation in casual conversation as being more informal. No attempt is made to distinguish which variety of "friend" the individual is; this is assumed to be known to anyone who might be present. It is possible that some of the confusion in this regard is a product of contact with white people, many of whom have *hâic* as practically the only Comanche word in their vocabularies, and use it as a greeting without discrimination; but this does not seem to be the most important factor, for there is every indication that this lack of clear definition of the application of the term is aboriginal. However, the use of *hâic* as an equivalent of "sweetheart" does seem to have been a translation of the American "girl friend," "boy friend."

This lack of clarity makes it practically impossible to formulate any even approximate behavior pattern associated with this term if, indeed, any exists; such opinions as were offered in answer to general questions were obviously references to one or both of the focal relationships, in spite of the fact that the term is seldom applied to own brothers, and the formal friendship, when it did exist, was far from including all the individuals who were regularly called *hâic*. An analogous situation is apparent in our own culture where "friendship," is conceived of as a warm and unselfish relationship, expressive of all our more worthwhile values, and yet one considers hundreds of people "friends" toward whom one is willing to display little more of this ideal behavior than a cheery "hello."

The feminine counterpart of *hâic*, *ɨ'·i?*, operates in about the same way, and its usage is often no clearer. Whether the institutionalized friendship ever existed here, and if so, what its basis was, is not apparent. Inasmuch as the affairs of women between themselves were generally considered to be pretty trivial by the dominant warriors of days gone by, it is almost certain that no friendship among them could have achieved the public recognition which the *hâic* relationship did. It is not clear whether women recognized the especially close friendships which obviously existed among them as being a comparable phenomenon, though they presumably did.

602 *Discussion.* It is obvious from the foregoing brief discussion of behavior that there is a definite and distinctive pattern associated with each relationship situation, and that each relative has a number of more or less clear-cut functions toward the individual. While these patterns are unquestionably identified to some extent by the use of kinship terms, it cannot be said on the basis of this alone that the terms are themselves the primary factors in determining behavior; a close group of relatives might well function in much the same way even if their relationships were not terminologically conceptualized.

But the real test can be applied when the terms are used outside of the

/page 37 continued/

C one of the younger separationists is drawing closer to the Peyotists
665 to gain support. The result is that in order to maintain any semblance
795 of unity and brotherly love in the Peyote meeting John and his "brothers" must withdraw from the political arena. /38/ Whether
C this withdrawal is successful may be questioned. I also wonder
K how real the brotherhood of the Peyote community really is. But
795 such is the ideal and it determines actions to an extent. One must
C also ask how strong the claim relationship of "friend" and "brother"
K is. It is certainly a formality in many instances. But I have heard
608 of cases where the formality was kept up in spite of many aggravating
372 situations only to be discarded after a tribial act on the part of one of the parties involved.

C Granting that generalities are premature, some things do
K strike me as peculiar to the situation, that is some reactions to
665 rivalries, competition, or whatever, are not what one would expect of our culture. The present factioning may be traced back in part to a rivalry between two young men. One a Comanche the other a
C Kiowa. It has been noted that much of the lining up of the sides is
K determined by kinship and claim relationship ties. Something small
[602] may grow into something big. Similar situations have been recorded
[608] for other plains tribes in other periods. What does impress me is the tendency to splinter, to withdraw. Rather than a cooperative effort on the part of two or more opposition groups ending in decisive action, there is instead a multiplying of opposition groups, less
C action and more talk. This, in spite of the fact that the frustrations
K of contact with the white world might also be expected to develop a
177 degree of concerted reaction to annoying problems. In any event
665 further investigation must ask whether the present situation is one of long standing and if so whether it is due to the pressures of the White culture and/or the nature of the native culture itself.